Appl. No. 09/674,648 Amdt. dated December 3, 2009 Reply to Office action of August 3, 2009

## Remarks

Claims 1 and 3 - 5, and 19 are pending.

Claim 1 has been clarified to recite, inter alia:

i) "subjecting the tube to axial forces and a medium under high internal pressure so that the tube expands to form said hollow cam regions, wherein the diameter of the tube in said region are greater than the diameter of the tube at the non-hollow cam regions." This is supported by Figures 1 and 3 of the specification.

Claim 19 has been amended to recite, inter alia, "The method as set forth in claim 1, wherein the diameter of bearer rings have wall thickness which are not constant." This is supported by paragraph [0020] of the specification.

The rejection of claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable variously over Suzuki, and Jordan is respectfully traversed. These references alone, or in combination, do not teach or suggest, "wherein the diameter of the tube in said region are greater than the diameter of the tube at the non-hollow cam regions." In contrast, Suzuki's patent discloses expansion of their tube only in their non-cam regions (see fig.1, fig. 5, fig. 11), and accordingly, their diameters in the cam regions are less than their non-cam regions. Similarly, Jordan shows that their tube dimensions in their cam regions as a result of their tube expansion do not extend beyond their non-cam regions, as tube diameters are actually decreased (see fig. 1 regions 8). Dawson is also deficient. Indeed, Dawson either shows cam regions with a decrease in tube dimensions compared to non-cam regions (see first cam from left on fig. 3), or cam regions (see second cam from left on fig. 3) where only one side of the tube is expanded, thereby not resulting in diameter increases at these cam regions. Accordingly, none of the references teach or suggest this limitation.

The rejection of claim 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable variously over Suzuki, and Jordan is separately traversed. None of the references cited show bearer rings where the diameter of their wall thickness are not constant.

Appl. No. 09/674,648 Amdt. dated December 3, 2009 Reply to Office action of August 3, 2009

Moreover, the office action suggests there would be motivation to keep the wall thicknesses constant. Accordingly, this claim should be allowed.

Applicants believe the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully solicit a Notice of Allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fees required associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3881. If an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition therefore and charge any additional fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-3881. A duplicate copy of this paper is enclosed.

Dated: December 3, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Richard (M. Tun

Registration No.: 56,594
BERLINER & ASSOCIATES
555 West Fifth Street, 31<sup>st</sup> Floor
Los Angeles, California 90013